

MINUTES OF THE CITY COUNCIL

CITY OF AUSTIN, TEXAS

Recessed Meeting  
of July 14, 1966

July 15, 1966  
9:00 A. M.

Council Chamber, City Hall

The meeting was called to order with Mayor Palmer presiding.

Roll call:

Present: Councilmen LaRue, Long, Shanks, White, Mayor Palmer  
Absent: None

Present also: W. T. Williams, Jr., City Manager; Doren R. Eskew, City Attorney; Reuben Rountree, Jr., Director of Public Works; Robert A. Miles, Chief of Police

At 9:00 A. M. the Council resumed its business of the recessed meeting of July 14, 1966.

Mayor Palmer announced the City had received a letter from Senator Ralph Yarborough and Congressman Jake Pickle stating the City of Austin had been awarded \$784,484 for the Open Space Program for the Decker Creek Area.

Mr. W. T. Williams, Jr., City Manager made a report dealing with wages and salaries of city employees. He stated the City Council had requested him to look into an increase and he submitted a "Wage and Salary Survey--Local Organizations (Projected to October 1, 1966)". He explained how the comparisons were made and he thought the local comparison was more valid than any other comparison as it most seriously affected the rates of pay for the City. The chart showed the mean average of all city employees would be 11.06 below average as of October 1, 1966. He explained no local comparison could be made for the Firemen and Policemen and their comparison had been made with other cities. He submitted "Comparison of Police Salaries - 13 Largest Texas Cities" and "Comparison of Fire Salaries - 13 Largest Texas Cities". He discussed the percent variation in these two comparisons. The City Manager then submitted a "Proposed Schedule - Master Wage and Salary Schedule" and "Proposed Pay Schedules - Police and Fire Departments". He said if these rates for all employees were applied it would place the City in a fairly competitive position with other local organizations; that it would raise the mean percentage 8% and with the fringe benefits they would be in pretty good shape. He stated in the proposed schedule starting with Group 1, Step 1, the increase would be about 23%; in the middle groups it would be 6 to 8%; and in the higher groups it would be 8 to 10%. The City Manager recommended

an adjustment of about 10% for the Department and Assistant Department Heads. He listed the present salaries and fringe benefits as \$13,938,063 and with the proposed new rates it would be \$15,059,790 making an increase of \$1,121,727. He stated after making a study of different ways to finance the increase he recommended a tax increase of 10¢ per \$100 valuation. He cautioned that later the rates at Brackenridge Hospital might have to be raised to cover the cost of the service, but there would not be a utility raise. At this point the hearing of the report was recessed.

The Mayor announced it was 10:00 A.M. and the Council would continue the hearing of June 30, 1966, on the appeal filed by Mr. Sam Wood on behalf of the residential property owners on North and West Fresco from a decision of the City Planning Commission approving a special permit for offices and retail specialty shops in the Highland Medical Center Subdivision located at 5001-5039 Highland Medical Center and 2815-2841 Hancock Drive. He said the action of the Planning Commission was to approve the special permit subject to the following conditions: vacation of the subdivision; vacation of the street; retention of electric easement; payment of 1965 taxes; and restrictions as shown on the amended site plan. MR. PAUL JONES, Attorney, represented MR. HOWARD E. BRUNSON, the applicant. He showed on a map the different zoning in the area showing the area along Hancock Drive as developing to commercial. He said this property was changed to "O" Office in 1959 and that 14 of the 21 property owners who were opposing had bought their property since that time; that there had been no loss of value on property on North and West Fresco. He listed the proposed offices that were to be in the center and all but two were permitted in "O" Office. The two that required "LR" Local Retail zoning were a ladies ready to wear and a cleaning shop. Mr. Jones brought out that if the special permit were granted they would be required to go exactly by the plans submitted and if there were any change they would be required to make another application. He displayed a picture of the building and discussed the maintenance of the fence, shrubbery, and the 7' drive easement. He stated the parking would be in the center, service would be from the front of the building and that all of the plans had been approved by the Building Inspector's Office. Mr. Jones read the list of restrictions placed on the use of the property in conjunction with the proposed development by the Planning Commission as follows:

1. The size and type of signs shall be limited to those types permitted under the "O" Office classification.
2. That there shall be no outside storage.
3. That the developer will continue to maintain the existing fence.
4. That this special permit shall cover only 6,000 square feet located in the area so designated on the plat and that the use be restricted to retail shops selling only apparel. That the cleaning shop be located in an area not greater than 1,100 square feet and that this be entirely on the front portion of the northeast corner of subject property which abuts "C" Commercial.
5. That the development be tied only to that plan filed with the Planning Department and approved by the Planning Commission.
6. That the site plan be arranged to provide a 25 foot front setback.
7. That the service easement be surfaced as permitted by the City.
8. In the event widening of Hancock Drive is deemed necessary, five feet will be provided for such widening.

July 15, 1966

Mr. Jones reviewed the amendment to the Master Plan regarding Planned Developments and stated it was very similar to what they have here. He requested the Council to support the 8 to 1 vote and sustain the Planning Commission to grant the Special Permit.

MR. SAM WOOD, 2807 W. Fresco Drive, opposed the special permit. He reviewed the zoning of this property, stating in 1956 a request for a change from "A" Residence to "O" Office was recommended by the Planning Commission and denied by the City Council. In 1959 a request to "LR" Local Retail was denied by the City Council but was granted to "O" Office. In 1961 a special permit was requested. He said the property owners at this time filed a petition asking that the zoning be returned to "A" Residence. He stated at this time Mr. Brunson was a member of the Planning Commission and took an unusual interest in the case and through his influence a compromise was worked out whereby the request for the special permit was withdrawn (it had been granted but had not yet been signed by the Planning Commission) and the property owners withdrew their request that it be changed to "A" Residence thereby leaving the property "O" Office. MR. TELFORD FERGUSON, 5007 N. Fresco, opposed the special permit. He said they became disturbed in the owners trying to change to "LR" Local Retail or "C" Commercial and they ask for the change back to "A" Residence for protection of their own property. They felt if Mr. Brunson was granted this special permit it would be used later as a wedge and there would be a creeping change in the area. He felt a compromise had been worked out and it should remain that way. MR. PAUL LUNDGREN, N. Fresco Drive, opposed the special permit, stating he had purchased his property after it was zoned "O" Office and he was assured at that time it was all settled. MR. WALLACE MAYFIELD, owner, spoke for the granting of the special permit. He said he had tried to put in a Medical Center but it had not worked out and he had now entered into a contract for the sale of the property to Mr. Brunson. In discussion of the compromise the City Attorney advised that private agreements would not be binding, but the opposition felt this was a moral issue.

MR. JONES gave a summary of their request stating it was their right to ask for a special permit, this was not a zoning change, there was no conflict of interest, the members of the Planning Commission have no moral or legal obligation to give up their right to develop land because they are on the Planning Commission; there had been no down grade in property values because of the "O" Office zoning of this property, and no evidence had been submitted on which to deny this. He said if the special permit were granted it would be tied to the specific uses named.

The opposition stated they opposed the granting of any use not permitted under "O" Office. MRS. HAROLD M. WHITE, JR., 2805 Fresco, spoke in opposition. She said when "LR" Local Retail was permitted in "O" Office it was a change of zoning and she felt Mr. Brunson could find two more things that would be permitted under "O" Office and then he would not need a special permit.

MR. MAYFIELD stated when they made this compromise and settled on "O" Office he was aware that he had the privilege of asking for a special permit and he felt there was no moral issue involved. Councilman Long stated when a member of the Planning Commission worked out an agreement there could be some question. Councilman Shanks stated if Mr. Brunson had contacted the neighbors and told them what he intended to do they would have helped but he felt he had acted in bad taste. MR. RONNIE EVANS, 2808 W. Fresco, opposed the change. He said that when people sell their property they refer to the Cancer Society Building saying that this development will be similar to it.

Councilman White moved that the Special Permit be granted. The motion, seconded by Councilman LaRue, failed to carry by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, White

Noes: Councilmen Long, Shanks, Mayor Palmer

The Special Permit was DENIED.

At 11:50 A.M. the Council recessed until 2:00 P.M.

RECESSED MEETING

2:00 P.M.

At 2:00 P.M. the Council resumed its business.

The Council had before it again the recommendation of the City Manager dealing with pay raises for city employees and a tax increase to finance these raises. The City Manager briefly reviewed his recommendation. Councilman LaRue inquired if this were accepted today would this exclude any additional employees being hired. The City Manager said each department head had included in their budget the number they thought they could get by with. Councilman Long said the pay schedules as submitted by the City Manager seemed fair and equitable but she was not ready to vote today as she wanted to relate this to the budget as a whole. She was in accord with the 23% increase for the lower group. Discussion of preparing the budget was held, whether or not to include the raises and tax rate increase. Councilman White said he was glad to see the employees get a raise as they were past due and he realized there would be a need for a tax increase. The Mayor asked if the Council was ready to informally approve a 10% tax increase and the salary increases as submitted by the City Manager. Councilman Long said she was not willing today to vote on the tax increase. Councilman White said he was not ready either. Councilman Shanks moved that the City Manager be instructed to prepare the budget on a tentative tax rate increase of 10%. The motion died for lack of a second.

Brief discussion of salaries for Department Heads was held. Councilman Long stated she thought if the Council set a salary for a Department Head the City Manager should pay that amount and she wanted to see the ordinance providing that he did not have to follow the budget. The City Manager said this was in the Charter, he could not exceed the budget but he could pay less.

Councilman Shanks brought up the question of the City Manager's job. He said the City of Austin was a business, you have to buy good talent, and that you need good key personnel to make a business run correctly. He read a comparison of salaries of City Managers of ten cities in Texas. They were Dallas, San Antonio, Fort Worth, Austin, Corpus Christi, Amarillo, Lubbock, Beaumont, Wichita Falls and Waco. Only Waco paid their City Manager less than Austin and that by only \$6.00. He brought out that only Austin has a big utility system and city hospital under the supervision of its City Manager. The low salary of this job has an oppressive tendency on the department heads and needs to be corrected, and he proposed now was the time to adjust the City Manager's salary to \$25,000 a year. Councilman White thought they should think of the "little boys" first. Councilman Long said in view that they had a recommendation of 10% raise for the Department Heads she thought 10% would be equitable for this job. The City

July 15, 1966

Manager said he would refuse the raise if it were given to him. Councilman LaRue said he agreed that as long as they keep the City Manager's salary down it holds down the Department Heads and he thought the City Manager should receive more whether he takes it or not.

Councilman Shanks moved that the Council adopt the Wage and Salary Plan. The motion died for lack of a second. Councilman Long again stated she wanted to relate it to the budget. Councilman White wanted to relate it to the budget also.

Councilman Shanks again moved that the Wage and Salary Schedule as submitted by the City Manager be adopted. The motion died for lack of a second. Councilman LaRue stated he didn't want to do anything that would be disruptive of the budget. Mayor Palmer polled each member of the Council as to their wishes and each member informally approved the schedules as submitted. The Mayor brought up the question of raises for the appointees of the Council suggesting 10%. Councilman Long wanted to discuss these along with the City Manager's when they review the rest of the budget. Discussion was held on when the budget would be reviewed. The Mayor stated it was generally agreed that the City Manager proceed with the schedules as presented. He said the salaries were out of line now, that the Council wants good fair salaries, not high but competitive and he felt the public would accept a tax increase for a salary increase for city employees.

The City Manager submitted the following:

"July 15, 1966

"Mr. W. T. Williams, Jr.  
City Manager  
Austin, Texas

"Dear Mr. Williams:

"Sealed bids were received until 11:00 A.M., Friday, July 15, 1966 at the Office of the Director of the Water and Sewer Department for the INSTALLATION OF 2,264 feet of 8-inch Cast Iron Water Mains in U. S. HIGHWAY NUMBER 81 From RUNDBERG LANE to KEN AVENUE. The purpose of this installation is to reinforce the water supply to the Water District Number 7 Area. The bids were publicly opened and read in the Second Floor Conference Room, Municipal Building, Austin, Texas.

"The following is a tabulation of bids received:

<u>"Firm</u>	<u>Amount</u>	<u>Working Days</u>
Bill Tabor Construction Company	\$14,320.40	12
Walter Schmidt	15,256.60	30
J. C. Evans Construction Company	15,297.80	30
Ford-Wehmeyer, Inc.	15,856.20	30
Capitol City Utilities	17,275.20	35
John R. Hughes Construction Company	17,515.00	45
Bland Construction Company	18,915.20	45
Griffin Construction Company	24,094.37	45
City of Austin (Estimate)	16,133.60	29

July 15, 1966

"It is recommended that the contract be awarded to Bill Tabor Construction Company on their low bid of \$14,320.40 with 12 working days.

"Yours truly,  
s/ Victor R. Schmidt, Jr.  
Victor R. Schmidt, Jr., Director  
Water and Sewer Department"

The City Manager stated the purpose of this installation is to reinforce the water supply to the Water District Number 7 Area.

Councilman Long offered the following resolution and moved its adoption:

(RESOLUTION)

WHEREAS, bids were received by the City of Austin on July 15, 1966, for the installation of 2,264 feet of 8-inch cast iron water mains in U. S. Highway Number 81, from Rundberg Lane to Ken Avenue; and,

WHEREAS, the bid of Bill Tabor Construction Company, in the sum of \$14,320.40, was the lowest and best bid therefor, and the acceptance of such bid has been recommended by the Director of Water and Sewer Department of the City of Austin, and by the City Manager; Now, Therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF AUSTIN:

That the bid of Bill Tabor Construction Company, in the sum of \$14,320.40, be and the same is hereby accepted, and that W. T. Williams, Jr., City Manager of the City of Austin, be and he is hereby authorized to execute a contract, on behalf of the City, with Bill Tabor Construction Company.

The motion, seconded by Councilman Shanks, carried by the following vote:  
Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, Shanks, White, Mayor Palmer  
Noes: None

Councilman Long moved that the Council instruct that a letter be written to Mrs. Jessie McIlroy Smith thanking the Travis County Historical Society for the presentation of the flag for the City Manager's Office. The motion, seconded by Councilman LaRue, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, Shanks, White, Mayor Palmer  
Noes: None

Councilman Long moved that the San Jose Church be granted permission for a Sunday Dance at the Auditorium from 2:00 P.M. to 6:00 P.M. on July 24th. The motion, seconded by Councilman White, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, Shanks, White, Mayor Palmer  
Noes: None

Councilman Long moved that the City Manager be authorized to purchase Lot 20, Block A, Highland Park Addition, locally known as 4504 Highland Terrace, from Denman Moody in the amount of \$10,500. (Right-of-way for the 45th Street underpass) The motion, seconded by Councilman White, carried by the following

July 15, 1966

vote:

Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, Shanks, White, Mayor Palmer  
Noes: None

Councilman Shanks moved that the City Manager be authorized to enter into an agreement with Southern Pacific Railroad Company for the furnishing of material and labor for the Decker Power Plant track. The motion, seconded by Councilman White, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, Shanks, White, Mayor Palmer  
Noes: None

Councilman LaRue stated that Mr. Cain had called attention that on the 2nd page of the Little Texas proposal they had \$5,000 for the 1st year and \$10,000 for the 2nd year and this was inadvertently left in for the life of the contract. Councilman LaRue said it was his thought that the intention of the Council was that this should terminate after the 2nd year, and would not be in addition to what the City was to receive for the third year and thereafter. Councilman LaRue moved to remove the \$10,000 payment for the third and subsequent years. The motion, seconded by Councilman White, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, Shanks, White, Mayor Palmer  
Noes: None

There being no further business Councilman Long moved that the Council adjourn. The motion, seconded by Councilman LaRue, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, Shanks, White, Mayor Palmer  
Noes: None

The Council adjourned at 3:15 P.M. subject to the call of the Mayor.

APPROVED

*L. L. Palmer*  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Mayor

ATTEST:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Assistant City Clerk